



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/650,159 | 08/28/2003 | Bradley D. Schweigert | KMC-596 | 7051 |

20322 7590 08/24/2005

SNELL & WILMER
ONE ARIZONA CENTER
400 EAST VAN BUREN
PHOENIX, AZ 850040001

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

HUNTER, ALVIN A

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3711

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/650,159

Applicant(s)

SCHWEIGERT, BRADLEY D

Examiner

Alvin A. Hunter

Art Unit

3711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

1. Claims 1-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Hamburger (USPN 6641487) in view of Currie et al. (US 2002/0193184) and applicant's admission.

Regarding claim 1, Hamburger discloses a putter club head comprising a club head body having a heel, toe, striking face, and a body axis, a hosel including a leg portion where in the leg portion is configured to accept a shaft along a shaft axis wherein the shaft axis defines a lie angle with respect to the body axis (See Figure 1). Hamburger discloses that the structure of the club head made be made of any material such as metal or plastic in which metal is commonly known to undergo plastic deformation through bending and stretching. If in doubt, Currie discloses a fitting method for a custom made putter wherein the hosel is bent to accommodate the aiming tendencies of the user (See Paragraph 0109). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to plastically deform the hosel, as taught by Currie et al., in order to accommodate the user's aiming tendencies. Hamburger does not explicitly disclose the hosel having a boss. Applicant admits that it is common practice within the art to

Art Unit: 3711

have a boss attached to the leg portion of a hosel to receive a shaft. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to place a boss on the leg portion of Hamburger in order to facilitate attachment of a shaft. The term "configured" does not require the invention to carry out the intended use; only be capable of carrying out the intended use in which Hamburger achieves. It also should be noted that the hosel is configured such that the body axis is parallel to a playing surface.

Regarding claims 2-4, and 7, Applicant does not set forth any evidence as to why a forward slant of between 1 to 6 degrees is critical in order to attain the invention. Hamburger discloses the hosel having a forward slant in which, from Figure 3, is shown to conceal the leg portion. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have the forward slant of any angle so long as the leg portion is concealed.

2. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamburger (USPN 6641487) in view of Currie et al. (US 2002/0193184) and applicant's admission further in view of Chuzo (JP 02-068080).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Hamburger does not disclose having a horizontal section extending from the boss. Chuzo disclose a putter having a hosel with a horizontal portion 2 wherein the leg portion of the hosel is rectangular (See Abstract and Figure 3). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have a horizontal portion, as taught by Chuzo, in order to line up the golf club with the target. Also, hosels are known within the art to have different shapes, wherein a rectangular shaped hosels are also known as proven by Chuzo. The leg portion of the hosel of Chuzo supports the horizontal portion as well as inherently provides an aesthetic look to

Art Unit: 3711

the club head. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have a rectangular leg portion, as taught by Chuzo, in order to support the horizontal portion of the hosel and to improve the aesthetics of the club head.

3. Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamburger in view of Currie et al. (US 2002/0193184), applicant's admission and Jackson (The Modern Guide to Golf Clubmaking).

Regarding claim 8, Hamburger discloses a putter club head comprising a club head body having a heel, toe, striking face, and a body axis, a hosel including a leg portion where in the leg portion is configured to accept a shaft along a shaft axis wherein the shaft axis defines a lie angle with respect to the body axis (See Figure 1). Hamburger discloses that the structure of the club head made be made of any material such as metal or plastic in which metal is commonly known to undergo plastic deformation through bending and stretching. If in doubt, Currie discloses a fitting method for a custom made putter wherein the hosel is bent to accommodate the aiming tendencies of the user (See Paragraph 0109). One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to plastically deform the hosel, as taught by Currie et al., in order to accommodate the user's aiming tendencies. Hamburger does not explicitly disclose the hosel having a boss. Applicant admits that it is common practice within the art to have a boss attached to the leg portion of a hosel to receive a shaft. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to place a boss on the leg portion of Hamburger in order to facilitate attachment of a shaft. The term "configured" does not require the invention to carry out the intended use; only be capable of carrying out the

Art Unit: 3711

intended use in which Hamburger achieves. It also should be noted that the hosel is configured such that the body axis is parallel to a playing surface. Also, Jackson discloses a method for customizing a golf club head comprising providing a golf club head including a club head body having a body axis wherein a shaft or shaft connecting portion is attached to the club head, determining a target lie angle, and adjusting the lie angle to the target lie angle by plastically deformation. Jackson does not explicitly disclose the club having a hosel constructed of a leg portion and boss portion. It should be noted that a forward slant is not necessary in order to deform the leg portion and, therefore, could be deformed having any predetermined angle with respect to the body axis.

Regarding claim 9-11, Jackson does not disclose a specific degree of lie angle change. The degree of the lie is a measurement that varies by user. One having ordinary skill in the art would have drawn from Jackson that the lie angle may be deformed to any angle degree so long as it fits the user's needs.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin A. Hunter whose telephone number is (571) 272-4411. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM Eastern Time.

Art Unit: 3711

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich, can be reached on 571-272-4415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Alvin A. Hunter, Jr.



STEPHEN BLAU
PRIMARY EXAMINER